

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-12, 15, and 22-24 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action dated March 30, 2011, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 15, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Additionally, the Examiner asserted that claims 1-12, 15, and 22 are directed to inventions that are distinct from that originally claimed such that claims 1-12, 15, and 22 are withdrawn. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 15, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,252 (“Dupray”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,807,571 (“Hatano”). In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-11, cancelled claims 12, 15, and 22, and added new claim 25.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to remove the language objected to by the Examiner. Applicants request reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims.

III. Election/Restriction

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to remove the language objected to by the Examiner. Applicants request reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and New Claim 25

Amended independent claim 1 and new independent claim 25 each generally recite “comparing the text that may be a name of a locality to a data set comprising at least one of town, province, or country names to verify the locality name in the text of the search criteria.” Neither the cited portions of Dupray nor the cited portions of Hatano teach this element. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Dupray and Hatano does not render unpatentable amended independent claim 1 and new independent claim 25, or any claim that depends on claim 1.

V. Rejection of Claims 23 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claim 23 generally recites “holding in a location module geographic location information mapped from a user’s computer network address that is an IP address.” In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Dupray teaches holding, in a location module, geographic location information mapped from a user’s computer network address. (See final Office Action dated March 30, 2011, page 10). Applicants note that the Examiner has failed to explain how Dupray, alone or in combination with Hatano, teaches holding in a location module geographic location information mapped ***from a user’s computer network address that is an IP address*** as recited in claim 231. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case that the proposed combination of Dupray and Hatano teaches each element of claim 23. For at least this reason, independent claim 23 and any claim that depends on claim 23 is patentable over the combination of Dupray and Hatano as contemplated by the Examiner.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott W. Brim/
Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200